

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/668,253	BECHTOLSHEIM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Aaron Strange	2153	

All Participants:

(1) Aaron Strange.

(2) Cindy S. Kaplan (40,043).
Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 5 May 2005
Time: 9:30
Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

35,53,65,80,83, and 90

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See attachment

Part III.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Regarding claim 35, it was noted that claim 37, from which claim 35 depends, contains all limitations of claim 35. The Examiner recommended cancellation of claim 35.

Regarding claim 53, it was noted that "said plurality of network elements" in lines 8-9 lacked antecedent basis. The Examiner recommended that "comprising a plurality of network elements" be added to the preamble, similar to claim 37.

Regarding claim 65, it was noted that "said plurality of network elements" in lines 7-8 lacked antecedent basis. The Examiner recommended that "comprising a plurality of network elements" be added to the preamble, similar to claim 37.

Regarding claim 80, it was noted that line 3 still referred to Ethernet frames. The Examiner recommended that "Ethernet frames" be changed to "Ethernet packets" to maintain consistent terminology.

Regarding claim 83, it was noted that line 2 still referred to Ethernet frames. The Examiner recommended that "Ethernet frames" be changed to "Ethernet packets" to maintain consistent terminology.

Regarding claim 90, it was noted that line 3 still referred to Ethernet frames. The Examiner recommended that "preserving the Ethernet frame structure" be changed to "maintaining the format of the Ethernet packet" to maintain consistent terminology.

Ms. Kaplan and the Examiner agreed to enter the Examiner's recommendations via Examiner's Amendment.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/668,253	BECHTOLSHEIM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Aaron Strange	2153	

All Participants:

(1) Aaron Strange.

(2) Cindy S. Kaplan (40,043).

Status of Application: Non-Final

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 11 May 2005

Time: 12:30

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

41, 45, 49

Prior art documents discussed:

Edem et al. (US 5,559,796)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Attachment

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Independent claims 41, 45, and 49, entered via the after-final amendment on 4/11/2005, were discussed in light of a newly discovered reference to Edem et al. The originally indicated allowability of claims 46 (now claim 45) and 49 has been withdrawn in light of the Edem et al. reference.

The Examiner and Ms. Kaplan agreed to re-open prosecution in order to apply Edem et al. and fix the issues previously discussed on 5/2 and 5/5.

The Examiner's Amendment originally discussed will no longer be made.